

REMARKS

These remarks are submitted in response to the Office Action mailed 7/14/2004.

Applicants appreciatively acknowledge the allowance of claims 19-34. Applicants also acknowledge the indication that claims 6 and 12-17 recite allowable subject matter.

Claims 1-5, 7-11, 18, and 43-45 stand rejected by the Examiner as being anticipated by Splett et al. Splett et al. teach a method of data compression useful for implanted devices that have limited memory capacity. The implanted device of Splett et al. has electrodes implanted at known locations. The electrodes are never moved and so there is no structure for tracking or acquiring location data nor is there any suggestion that location data concerning the electrodes ever be collected.

The Examiner refers to the data samples on waveform 200 in support of the rejection of these claims, but the X_0 , X_1 , X_2 data points bear no relation to different locations of heart tissue. Instead, data X_0 , X_1 , X_2 refer to different moments in *time* at which *physiologic data values* are collected.

In contrast, the invention defined by independent claims 1, 3 and 7 recites structure or steps “for obtaining location data.” The methods of these claims all incorporate the use of catheters that are equipped so as to be suitable for obtaining location data because catheters are moved about within the patient whereas the implanted electrodes of Splett et al. are stationary.

With further regard to claim 1, data points associate “the physiologic data obtained by each first means at the first moment in time with the location data obtained by the second means at the first moment in time.” Any association in memory of physiologic and location data for any other {W:\01780\0001605000\00229189.DOC | [REDACTED]}

Appl. No.: 09/943,408
Amdt. Dated Jan. 12, 2005
Reply to Office Action of July 14, 2004

